COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER:

VOL. IV. No. 25.] *London, Saturday, 24th December*, 1803. [Price 10D

" Much as I approve of the Volunteer System, I must confess, that, rather than have Corps with their " Committees, I would not have the Corps at all; for, if these Committees are suffered to exist, I " have no hesitation to say, that the Monarchy is not safe for six months."——*Speech of Lord Romney, December* 16, 1803.

AN

ANALYTICAL AND COMPARATIVE VIEW, &c. &c.

(Continued from. p. 848.)

II. *The promise said to have been made by Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville, to give to Mr. Addington their constant, active, and zealous support.*

On this point, the Near Observer states: " that the country felt all the hazard and " difficulty of their [the new minister's si- " tuation]; and the *courage and self devoted- " ness*, with which they had succeeded to " the posts of danger, were the topics of ad- " miration and applause.—But, in obeying " the commands of their Sovereign, they " had felt and were deeply penetrated with, " the impossibility of serving him and their " country, in the great necessity of the " time, if that vast mass of talents, informa- " tion, and influence, over which Mr. Pitt " and Lord Grenville presided, were not " only suddenly withdrawn from the sup- " port of his Majesty's government, but " converted into an opposing, or even a neu- " tral force. Whatever may be the diffi- " culty and the delicacy, (for they are ex- " treme) of the point I am treating, I think " it indispensable to speak with courage and " with perspicuity; and I challenge the il- " lustrious persons I have just named to " controvert the fact or the spirit of a state- " ment, which it is important to the pre- " sent, and to the future ages, to place be- " yond controversy and dispute. I must " take upon me, therefore, to aver, that his " Majesty's most gracious offer of his con- " dence to Mr. Addington, could not have " been, *and was not definitively accepted, un- " til a solemn authentic pledge of honour had " been given by the late ministers, for their " 'constant, active, and zealous support!'* I " do assert that Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville " did sacredly and solemnly enter into this " exact engagement, and in this precise " form of words. You think with Hamlet, " 'she promises too much! Oh! but she'll " 'keep her word!'"

The Accurate Observer, that is to say, the advocate of Mr. Pitt, denies the facts here stated; but, before we hear him, it seems necessary to make an observation or two on the self contradiction of the statement of the Near Observer. In order to excite our admiration, or rather, to induce us to believe, that the people were struck with admiration, " of the *courage* and *self-devotedness*, with " which the new ministers had succeeded " to the posts of danger," he had before drawn a most woeful and disheartening picture of the state of the country in February, 1801, and, amongst all the other alarming circumstances, which he could find, or invent, he had added, that of the King's indisposition, which has already been proved to have commenced after the late ministers tendered their resignations, and to have terminated before the new ones were actually in place; so that, as to that point, these *courageous* and *self-devoted* persons, accepted of their places when his Majesty was perfectly well, remained out of them all the time that he was ill, and entered them after his recovery! But, if we admit the truth of the charge which the Near Observer now urges against the late ministry, and particularly against Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville; if we admit, that, though it was impossible, that those gentlemen should make a promise of giving uniform, unconditional, and unqualified support to their successors, yet that those successors might so understand them, and place reliance on them accordingly; if we admit this, which is the least that the Near Observer demands of us, where are we to look for that " *courage* and *self-devo- " tedness*, with which," he tells us, " the " new ministers succeeded to the *posts of " danger?*" Where, indeed, are we to look for *posts of danger*, in a ministry who expected, and relied upon, the constant, active, and zealous support of " that vast mass " of talents, information, and influence, " over which Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville " presided?"

It will, hereafter, be seen, that this notion of a *pledge*, given on the part of Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville, appears to have been invented by the Near Observer, for the purpose of rendering odious their parliamentary conduct, subsequent to the time when

Lord Grenville commenced a direct opposition, and when Mr. Pitt began to keep aloof from the ministers, shewing himself, at last, in a sort of hostile neutrality. The Accurate Observer, therefore, in order to smooth the way for Mr. Pitt's change of conduct, thus removes the obstacle of a promise of constant, active, and zealous support.—— "Mr. Pitt," says he, "undoubtedly, when "he retired from office, felt convinced, that "under the circumstances of the period, his "Majesty had selected for his advisers per- "sons, by whom it was probable, that the "government of the country would be wise- "ly and safely administered. He felt them, "therefore, entitled to his support, and, as "well as Lord Grenville, gave them his as- "surance of it. To give to any set of men "a promise of constant support, *let their "conduct be what it would*, is as inconsistent "with every idea of public duty, as it cer- "tainly is with common sense or common "honesty. Neither Mr. Pitt nor Lord "Grenville ever gave, nor did Mr. Adding- "ton understand, that he had received, such "promise. If, therefore, as the Near Ob- "server so pompously avers, the assurance "had been couched in the precise words, "*constant, active,* and *zealous* support, it "would have needed no sophistry to give to "the promise a limitation. But, what is "the real fact? The words, which are "quoted by our author, were made use of "by Lord Grenville *in a speech*, (20th March, "1801) in which he claimed for the new "administration the confidence of the coun- "try, as consisting of men, who had con- "stantly approved of the principles, upon "which he and his colleagues had enjoyed "the confidence, and received the support "of the nation, and who had, both publicly "and privately professed their intention of "continuing to act upon the same general "system, which had been adopted by their "predecessors. *As such*, his lordship said "they should have his 'constant, active, "'and zealous support.' With respect to "Mr. Pitt, it is not very necessary to in- "quire what were the particular words in "which he conveyed to his successors his "assurance of support; but, in this case, as "in that of Lord Grenville, there was not "only an implied, but an *express* limitation "to the promise. And Mr. Addington "could tell the Near Observer, that out of "the *three points* which Mr. Pitt, upon this "occasion, selected as essential conditions of "his support, *two* are those upon which he "has expressed his disapprobation of the "measures of the present government."— What these *three points* were, the Accurate Observer does not tell us, nor is his silence of any importance, except as it is another instance of his desire still to keep up a distinction between Mr. Pitt and every other of his colleagues, Lord Melville excepted; and, it is truly remarkable, that, in both pamphlets, this last mentioned nobleman is introduced as seldom as possible.

The folly of supposing, that any two men whatever, especially two such men as Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville, would make a solemn promise of constant and *unconditional* support of a ministry is, too great to be adopted by any one, however ignorant or prejudiced. But, there is positive proof *of the contrary*; for, both of these great persons, did, on every occasion when they spoke of their intention to support the new ministry, expressly state, as the condition of that support, that the new ministers should continue to act *upon the same principles* that had guided the conduct of their predecessors. Whoever will take the trouble to look back to the debates of February and March, 1801, will find, that this was the ground, on which both Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt asked for the support of Parliament in behalf of the new ministers; and that, it was on this very ground, that the new ministers were represented, by the Opposition, as being unworthy of the confidence of Parliament. A quotation or two from the speeches of Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt will place this point beyond all dispute.—"We go out of office "with a pledge to support our successors "*in pursuing the same measures, which we "ourselves adopted and pursued.*"* Mr. Pitt, in defending the new ministers, against an attack of Mr. Grey, said that they were worthy of the confidence of Parliament, because, in them, "the *measures*, the *system*, "the *principles*, which Parliament had so "often sanctioned, were to be *retained* and "*rigorously pursued.*"† Again, on a subsequent occasion, after the new ministers had actually entered on their offices, Mr. Pitt said: "What is the complaint [made "by Opposition] now? That the per- "sons who claim the support of the House, "explicitly they profess the *same principles* "as those who have so long enjoyed that "confidence..... All I contend for "is," said he, after describing the new ministry, "that the House is bound by the "best principles of policy, as well as by "the true spirit of the constitution of this

* Lord Grenville's speech, March 20, 1801. See Morning Chronicle of the 21st of that month.

† Speech of Feb. 16, 1801.

"country, to *wait to see the conduct* of the "ministers of the crown, before they with-"draw their confidence." ‡——Now, unless we believe, that Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt made, and that Mr. Addington relied on, promises, made in private, to support him through thick and thin, while they were, in public, thus carefully qualifying every thing they uttered in the shape of a promise of support; unless we believe this, we must reject, as the most shameful of misrepresentation, the Near Observer's pompous account of a pledge, given to the present ministers, by Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt, of "constant, active, and zealous support." The Near Observer asserts, however, not only that such assurances *were* given by Lord Grenville to Mr. Addington; but even that they were given *previous to that gentleman's acceptance of his office*, and were a principal motive for that acceptance! This is so far from the fact, as to his lordship, that Mr. Addington had actually accepted his office, and signified his acceptance in more than one quarter, *before* Lord Grenville was informed, that such an appointment was even *in the contemplation of any person living!* His lordship can, therefore, have had no share whatever in persuading Mr. Addington to consent to replace Mr. Pitt: a resolution for which, indeed, many people believe, that very little persuasion was necessary.—*After* the formation of the new ministry, Lord Grenville declared publicly, and in Parliament, that he would support the new ministers *so long* as they adhered to the system of their predecessors. This limitation was not *implied*, as the Accurate Observer seems to suppose, but was, to all appearance, studiously, and certainly very distinctly expressed, as we have above seen by a reference to the debates. The Near Observer quotes from those very debates the words which contained the promise of support, but carefully suppresses those which immediately follow, and which contain the condition by which the promise was limited. This condition was so *very distinctly expressed*, that Lord Grenville's declaration, of the system on which he expected the new ministers to act, was more than once referred to at the time in both Houses of Parliament; and was stated, as has already been shown, by the opposers of the old ministry as a sufficient ground for their with-holding their confidence from the new ministry. The fact therefore is proved beyond dispute. And, as this condition was stated in the hearing of the new ministers, they are as much bound by it as if they had themselves expressed it: since, if they meant not to fulfil it, every principle of plain dealing and sincerity required that they should undeceive Lord Grenville, and reject a support publicly proffered on conditions to which they were not willing to agree.——The question, therefore, as to breach of faith, is open to the judgment of the whole world. The new ministers had publicly pledged themselves to the system of their predecessors, Lord Grenville and his colleagues had publicly declared, that they would, *on that condition*, give the new government their support, in such a course of measures as would, in that case, have been entirely consonant to the opinions on which they themselves have uniformly acted, both in and out of office. If the new ministers have performed their part of this contract, the new opposition *is* guilty of a breach of faith. If, on the contrary, the new ministers have not performed that engagement, on which all the rest was grounded, the breach of faith *rests entirely with them*. The only real question therefore is, have the present ministers, or have they not, departed from the system of their predecessors? This question is already answered!—1st. By the notoriety of the fact itself; as to peace, war, neutrality, negotiation, and finance; in the desertion of allies, the surrender of conquests, the reduction of naval and military force, the abandonment of the Continent, and in one word as to every material question of domestic or foreign policy.—2dly. By the open and public manner in which the ministers themselves daily boast of that departure, and take merit for it.—3dly. By the complacency with which they have always accepted, and even courted, the assistance of those who avowedly give their assistance on no other grounds, but on those of such departure.—And 4thly. By the lavish censures which they themselves now bestow, in all their publications, on the whole and every part of the system of their predecessors, and most of all by the malignant abuse of it, which is contained in the very pamphlet now in question.

It has been before observed, that the notion of a pledge of support was evidently invented by Mr. Addington's partisan, for the purpose of rendering odious the opposition, which, since the preliminaries of peace, has been maintained by Lord Grenville, and, in some degree, by Mr. Pitt. But, before we come to the parliamentary conduct of these gentlemen, it is necessary to advert to a transaction of great weight

‡ Speech, March 25, 1801.

in the present examination, because to the result of this transaction, the Near Observer attributes, and not without too much appearance of truth, all the coldness and all the hostility, which Mr. Addington has experienced, or is likely to experience, at the hands of Mr. Pitt.

III. *The circumstances of the negotiation for the return of Mr. Pitt to office.*

This is a point of great importance, and, therefore, it will be proper to state, at full length, all that has, on both sides been said upon the subject.——"So far," says the Near Observer, "as I have had opportu-
"nity to observe, I think I may venture to
"assert, that the ministers maintained their
"usual good correspondence, and received
"the usual confirmations of support and
"friendship from Mr. Pitt till March last,
"and some time rather advanced in that
"month. Upon her Majesty's birth day,
"in January, I have heard that some tri-
"fling form and solemnity confirmed the
"bond, and that Mr. Pitt, who dined with
"the Chancellor of the Exchequer, took
"occasion to declare, that he would come
"to town and give government his assist-
"ance in Parliament upon the first ques-
"tion of importance, and upon any which
"they might think required his support;
"but having been at a distance at that
"time, and unwilling now to make parti-
"cular inquiries, I state it only as report.
"The friendship, however, continued till
"the period I have assigned. Nor can I
"state it as having been absolutely retract-
"ed or dissolved till about the third week
"in April, although there remained, in the
"interval, no appearances of its effect or
"existence. Very early in this month, it
"is well known, that a plan was in agita-
"tion for the admission of that right ho-
"nourable gentleman, and some of his
"friends, into the Cabinet. As far as I
"have observed, this negotiation *originat-*
"ed with Lord Melville, and was conducted
"by him; nor do I at all fear being mis-
"taken in stating, that the intentions and
"conduct of that noble lord were fair, ho-
"nourable, and impartial. I have great
"satisfaction in saying so, because I know
"a contrary opinion prevails, and because
"a subsequent vote of his lordship's has a
"tendency to maintain and encourage that
"opinion. Those persons, however, who
"had the means of near observation, be-
"lieved that the noble lord was almost as
"much hurt and disappointed at the ex-
"travagant proposition upon which the
"negotiation went off, as the ministers
"themselves were.——The war was now
"evidently approaching; and besides those
"personal habits of friendship, which at all
"times governed the mind of Mr. Adding-
"ton, the great talents and popularity of
"Mr. Pitt, amongst the monied persons,
"must have rendered him a most desirable
"acquisition to any administration in which
"he would take a part.—I treat here, and
"I am very sensible of it, upon tender
"ground; I feel that I may be uttering
"things better liked in silence, but not
"better suppressed; for the public and
"posterity are interested in the truth, and
"have a right to know it. That I do not
"much mislead them, I appeal to Lord
"Melville himself.—In that negotiation,
"which his lordship conducted, I think it
"proper that it should be known, that
"there was no obstacle upon the part of
"ministry to *his lordship's return*, with
"Mr. Pitt and other of his friends; I do
"not say upon a footing of equality with
"Mr. Addington and others of the present
"administration, but *beyond it*. It is pro-
"per, that it should be known, that the
"treaty did not go off (as has been pre-
"tended) on account of a want of a mes-
"sage from a quarter too high to be men-
"tioned, a communication which would
"not have been wanting in due time, if
"the negotiation could have been brought
"to an issue upon the terms I have men-
"tioned; but, that it broke off upon the
"*positive unalterable demand of Mr. Pitt*
"*himself, to bring back with him the Lords*
"*Grenville and Spencer*, with other noble
"and honourable persons, who had disap-
"proved of every measure of the govern-
"ment, who were in the habit of personal
"incivility and disrespect, and who were
"adverse to the whole spirit and principles
"of the administration.——We here see,
"that these recommendations, or rather
"dictates to the Sovereign, with which the
"session of Parliament opened, these loud
"demands for the return of Mr. Pitt to the
"confidence of his Majesty, have been
"faithfully and honourably *repaid*.——
"Lord Grenville *would* replace Mr. Pitt
"in power, and it had been very *ungrateful*
"if Mr. Pitt had forgotten the obligation.
"Thus have these illustrious persons
"maintained unbroken the bands of their
"political connexion, in spite of their dif-
"ference of opinion upon the greatest po-
"litical occurrences—and thus has Mr.

* Alluding to the close of the speech of Lord Grenville of November 23, 1802, and to that of Lord Temple of December 8, 1802. See Register, Vol. II. p. 1640 and 1737.

" Addington been deprived of Mr. Pitt's " friendship, notwithstanding every one of " his measures has received his support " and approbation!" —— This is very plainly insinuating, that, from the beginning of the session of Parliament, in the month of November, 1802, there took place an understanding between Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville, and, that the latter was to be "*repaid*" for his call in favour of the former by a place in the Cabinet, as soon as Mr. Pitt himself could obtain an entrance into it; and, though this insinuation is certainly most foul and unjust, yet, I must confess, that I never could reconcile either to reason or policy, the asserting, that Mr. Pitt was the only man capable of saving the country. Lord Grenville's words were these: " there is but *one man* in the king- " dom, to whom every eye is directed, to " whom every heart is attached, as *alone* " equal to rally the national force, as *alone* " equal to weather the storm." I have no doubt, that his lordship was perfectly sincere and disinterested in the delivery of this opinion; but, as I said then, so I say now, that I have no doubt of his having been greatly deceived. For, not only do I reject the humiliating notion of this kingdom's containing but *one* man; not only do I believe, that there are many men better calculated for weathering the approaching storm (for it is not yet come); but, I believe, that this storm never can be weathered with Mr. Pitt at the *helm*. As a *member* of an administration, he might do much; but as the chief director of it, he is, in my opinion, totally inadequate to the task which, in that situation, he would now have to perform. Whenever the return of Mr. Pitt to office has been the subject of remark, I have uniformly given it as my opinion, that we now stand in need of a system of politics and of political economy, totally new; and, as it is very evident, that such a system would never be introduced by Mr. Pitt, because the introducing of it would be to lay the axe to the root of his own fame, so I must, of course, be persuaded, that he is not the person to be minister in these times. Mr. Pitt, had he been again placed at the head of the Cabinet, would have had constantly in view the preservation of his system of funding, from which neither the stoppage of cash-payments at the Bank nor any other proof of his error would have weaned him. He would have continued war, or made peace, upon no other principle than that of the price of stocks. He was not the first inventor, not the father of the funding system, but that system is his adopted child; every wound it receives touches him to the heart; his public reputation is interwoven with it; with it, therefore, that reputation must perish, and, to prevent which it is by no means unreasonable to suppose, that he would be inclined to risk much more than the nation ought ever to risk. He would soon have found out the " prudence" of making another peace; he would soon have discovered, that the main object of the war was again accomplished; again would he have talked of " husbanding our resources against ano- " ther day of trial;" and thus would have ended the *second* punic war. —— While, however, I dissent, as to this particular point, from the opinion of Lord Grenville, while I would much rather see his lordship minister than Mr. Pitt, I by no means yield to the insinuation of the Near Observer.

In answer to what this writer has asserted on the subject of the negotiation for Mr. Pitt's return to office, the Accurate Observer makes the following statement. —— " I now " come," says he, " to speak of a transac- " tion, upon which I particularly request the " attention of my readers. I know that I " tread upon delicate ground, but in tread- " ing it I shall not deviate from the path of " truth. Upon a question interesting in it- " self, upon which curiosity had been much " excited, and upon which, from the nature " of it, little could be publicly known, the " Near Observer seems to have thought that " confident and positive assertion could not " fail to make an impression. No species " of falsehood is so certain of passing cur- " rent upon the world, as that which has " some degree of truth (however slight) for " its foundation; and the misrepresentation " of this transaction, however gross, appears " to be the misrepresentation of a person " who had the means (though certainly lit- " tle of the inclination) of stating its cir- " cumstances with correctness and preci- " sion. —— It is very far from my intention " to set down all the particulars which have " come to my knowledge upon this transac- " tion however well authenticated they may " be. Indeed I should not have entered at " all upon the subject, if it had not been for " the purpose of correcting misstatement, " and refuting and exposing calumny. I " confine myself therefore within the limits " of the Near Observer's misrepresentations, " premising only that no farther circum- " stances with which I am acquainted, vary " in any degree the general complexion of " the transaction. If I have mistaken or " misconceived any point, I call upon Mr. " Addington, or any of his friends, to cor-

" rect my error.——Towards the end of " March, or at the beginning of April, upon " the eve of war, after it was distinctly " known to Mr. Addington that Mr. Pitt " strongly disapproved of some of the lead- " ing measures of his government, and after " an overture had been made on the part of " Mr. Addington, *too foolish, I had almost* " *said, too insulting to be noticed,* a distinct " proposition, (originating, not, as has been " insinuated, with Lord Melville, but *entire-* " *ly with Mr. Addington himself,*) was " made to Mr. Pitt, the object of which was " his return to the official situation he for- " merly held in the administration; and, as " I understand, the arrangement was to " have taken place whenever the negotiation " then pending with France should have " been brought to a conclusion. It was " also signified, that vacancies would be " made for the purpose of admitting Lord " Melville into the Cabinet, and some other " of Mr. Pitt's friends into different official " situations. To this proposition Mr. Pitt " replied, that he would not enter upon the " question of arrangements, until he was " distinctly informed by a message from the " highest quarter, that his services were " thought essential; that if so called upon, " in spite of the precarious state of his " health, he should not decline the offer of " his best advice and assistance; that he " was fully aware of the great and increas- " ing difficulties of the country, and that he " saw the necessity of a strong, vigorous, " and efficient government. That if called " upon by his Majesty, he should feel it to " be his duty to propose an administration " consisting principally of the members *of* " *the present* and of the *late* government; " that, in the general arrangement which " he should submit for his Majesty's consi- " deration, he should, if they assented, in- " clude the Lords Grenville and Spencer, " but that he should *press no person what-* " *ever* upon his Majesty, only reserving to " himself the power of declining the under- " taking altogether, if he could not form " such a government as would enable him, " in his judgment, to conduct the affairs of " the nation with a fair probability of suc- " cess. No *sine qua non* was insisted upon, " as the Near Observer alledges with respect " to the admission of Lord Grenville, or of " any other person into the Cabinet. All " that Mr. Pitt required was, that he should " be at liberty to submit to his Majesty " whatever he thought best for his Majes- " ty's service, unfettered by any previous " condition, and he positively declined com- " mitting himself upon the question of par- " ticular arrangements, until his Majesty's " pleasure had been distinctly signified " to him. ——Such, I may venture to assert, " was the substance and spirit of Mr. Pitt's " conduct through the whole of the transac- " tion. What was that of Mr. Addington? " In bringing forward the proposition of " which I have spoken, he endeavoured to " make it a preliminary, that Lord Gren- " ville should not, in the first instance, be " included in any arrangement whatever. " On the grounds already stated, Mr. Pitt " refused to listen to such an exclusion, or " to any other particular stipulation pre- " vious to laying his ideas before his Ma- " jesty. How far, after knowing Mr. Pitt's " determination upon this point, Mr. Ad- " dington, for a time, felt, or expressed, a " disposition on his part to accede to it, I " will not take upon me to assert; but it " is, I believe, pretty certain, that after an " interval of deliberation, and after con- " sulting with his colleagues, he declared " ultimately, that nothing could induce " him to afford even the chance of admit- " ting Lord Grenville into the Cabinet, " and that this determination would allow " of no change. His Majesty of course " *was not advised* to send to Mr. Pitt, and " Mr. Addington's proposition fell to the " ground.——If this be a correct statement " of this transaction, (and if it be not, I " again call upon Mr. Addington or any " of his friends to contradict any part of it) " I ask what ground is there for describing " it as a negotiation set on foot by Mr. " Pitt for his return to office? What pre- " tence is there for calling it a scramble " for place? What foundation for the base " insinuation, that to the disappointment " occasioned by the failure of this negotia- " tion, not to fair and honest opinion upon " public grounds, is to be imputed the " disapprobation which Mr. Pitt has at " any time shewn of any of the measures " of the government? Mr. Pitt was *invited,* " (without any previous step taken on his " part) to a negotiation, the professed ob- " ject of which was, to place him at the " head of the government; instead of im- " patiently grasping at office, he declined " the proposal, because it was coupled " with conditions inconsistent with what " he felt due to his public situation, and " with his views of the public service. " With respect to the motives for his sub- " sequent conduct, I have sufficiently an- " swered all unworthy insinuations on that " head already, by mentioning a fact which " will not be contradicted—that Mr. Ad- " dington knew of Mr. Pitt's *decided dissi-*

" *probation of some of his principal measures*, be-
" fore this overture was made.——Mr.
" Addington evidently wished for the as-
" sistance of Mr. Pitt to strengthen *his* go-
" vernment, and this desire increased with
" the difficulty of his situation. It is equal-
" ly evident, that Mr. Pitt had no inclina-
" tion, whether from disapprobation of
" their general measures, from objection
" to any of the steps taken in the negotia-
" tion with France, or from any other
" cause, to agree to take office merely as
" an *accession* to the present administration.
" Amidst the difficulties with which we
" are surrounded, many persons may natu-
" rally wish, that Mr. Pitt had lent his as-
" sistance to the government in any man-
" ner in which it would have been re-
" ceived; because the insufficiency of the
" present administration, in our critical
" state, is very generally felt, and because
" Mr. Pitt would have infused energy and
" vigour into their councils, and would have
" been a tower of strength to them at this
" perilous moment. But surely it was for
" him *to appreciate* the talents and qualifica-
" tions of those with whom he was to *risk*
" his character, and to consider upon what
" terms he could return to office, consist-
" ently with his own credit and with the
" public interest. None can question his
" right to determine upon this point for
" himself."

The differences in the two accounts of this curious negotiation, are, 1. The Near Observer states, that the negotiation " ori-
" ginated with Lord Melville," and he afterwards terms it, " a negotiation set on
" foot by Mr. Pitt for his return to office;" whereas, his opponent declares (and he bids Mr. Addington contradict him if he can), that the negotiation " originated en-
" tirely with Mr. Addington himself." 2. The partizan of Mr. Addington asserts, that the negotiation broke off " upon the
" positive unalterable demand of Mr. Pitt
" to bring back with him the Lords Gren-
" ville and Spencer," and, it is afterwards stated, that the objection of Mr. Addington went to Lord Grenville alone; but, in contradiction to all this, the partizan of Mr. Pitt asserts, that, though Mr. Pitt did intend
" to propose an administration consisting
" principally of the *present* and of the *late*
" government; though he did state, that,
" in the general arrangement, which he
" should submit for his Majesty's consider-
" ation, he should, if they assented, in-
" clude the Lords Grenville and Spencer;"
yet that, " he should *press* no person what-
" ever upon his Majesty, only reserving to
" himself the power of declining the un-
" dertaking altogether;" that, " no *sine*
" *qua non* was insisted upon, with respect
" to the admission of Lord Grenville or
" any other person;" and that, as to the breaking off of the negotiation, Mr. Addington, after endeavouring to make the exclusion of Lord Grenville *a preliminary condition*, and meeting here with the direct refusal of Mr. Pitt, took some time to consult with his colleagues, and ultimately declared, " that nothing could induce him
" to afford even the chance of admitting
" Lord Grenville into the cabinet, and
" that this determination would allow of
" no change; and thus Mr. Addington's
" proposition fell to the ground."

Upon questions where the parties flatly contradict each other, it is impossible to come to a certainly correct decision, unless we are in possession of extraneous evidence. As to the first of these points, it is not only possible, but it really appears very likely, that *both* parties have, according to their best belief, spoken the truth; for, it will be observed, that Lord Melville was the go-between, the coupler, on this occasion; and, who shall tell us, that his lordship's anxiety to produce a junction so desirable, so necessary to the welfare of the nation, and so likely to form an irresistible rampart against the assaults of that " conspiracy for place," which he had discovered in the New Opposition; who shall assure us, that, for the sake of accomplishing objects so near his heart, his lordship did not act a part somewhat like that acted by Claudio and his companions with respect to Benedict and Beatrice. The Near Observer says, that the *negotiation* originated with Lord Melville, and the Accurate Observer says, that the *proposition* originated with Mr. Addington himself: both may be true: Lord Melville might, and I think he did, broach the subject to the minister, without the knowledge of Mr. Pitt, and thereupon Mr. Addington, from motives which are evident enough, made the proposition to which Mr. Pitt was, on certain conditions, willing to accede. If Mr. Addington had not regarded the negotiation as originating with Lord Melville, it is utterly incredible, that he should have countenanced the circulation of a statement to that effect; because, as the point was very material, he must have been certain, that such a statement would be contradicted, and that such contradiction would bring shame and disgrace upon his cause. Mr. Pitt's advocate sees this clearly enough; he perceives, that both accounts are, as far as relates to this point, substantially true; he knows, that

Lord Melville was the go-between, and, one would think, that he must know, that his lordship was the originator of the negotiation, which, indeed, he does not deny, but only says, that the *proposition* made to Mr. Pitt originated entirely with Mr. Addington himself; but, he is very careful not to assert, that this proposition was made *by* Mr. Addington *to Mr. Pitt*, or that it was made, either directly or indirectly, *before* Lord Melville opened the subject to Mr. Addington. Such an evasive statement is unworthy of the partizan of Mr. Pitt, especially when its object is to fix the charge of direct and premeditated falsehood on a man, with whom, be he what he may, Mr. Pitt was willing to share the powers of the state.

As to the 2d point, on which the assertions of these writers are opposed to each other, it does appear, that, Lord Grenville was *mentioned*, at least, by Mr. Pitt, as one of those whom he intended to introduce into the Cabinet. Such introduction was not, the Accurate Observer states, "a *sine qua non*," which I can very well believe, for Mr. Pitt has generally too much prudence to make declarations that have any thing definite in them; but, that, if he took an office himself, he would endeavour to have Lord Grenville with him, there can remain little doubt in the mind of any man, who, for a moment, considers, how desirable, and, indeed, how necessary, it would have been, to break up, or at least, cut asunder, the new opposition, the successful opposers of that peace, which was, at the time the Cabinet negotiation was going on, just about to terminate in a new and most vexatious and distressing war. Whether Lord Grenville would have been led over, in this manner, was another question; and, a question, which, I positively assert have been safely answered in the negative. Of this, however, the ministers were not certain; and, though the silencing of Lord Grenville, and with him the most formidable part of opposition in the House of Lords, was an object for which they would, probably, have made almost any sacrifice of national dignity or interest, yet the personal humiliation of themselves, which such a step would have produced, was what they appear to have been resolved never to consent to. Therefore they insisted, as a preliminary, that Lord Grenville should not be brought amongst them; and, as Mr. Pitt would make no stipulations of this sort, previous to his being called upon by the King, the negotiation was put an end to. There does not seem to be any thing in the difference of statement, as to this point, that can be fairly said to fix the charge of falsehood or misrepresentation on the Near Observer, who says, that the negotiation broke off "upon the positive unalterable demand of "Mr. Pitt to bring back with him the "Lords Grenville and Spencer;" and, his opponent says, that Mr. Pitt, having named the Lords Grenville and Spencer as persons whom he should propose, and having been asked by Mr. Addington to consent to a preliminary stipulation that Lord Grenville should not be brought back, *refused to enter into any stipulation at all*, and that, thereupon the negotiation was broken off. It may not be rigidly correct to describe this as "a po-"sitive and unalterable *demand* on the part "of Mr. Pitt, to bring back the Lords "Grenville and Spencer;" but, I am satisfied, that not one person out of ten will regard this description as *false*; and, if there has been, or is, any misrepresentation as to the fact, it is really, in my opinion, to be attributed to the *indefinite* manner, in which Mr. Pitt is said to have stated the terms, on which he was ready to make part of the proposed coalition. He did not, says his advocate, make the return of Lord Grenville a *sine qua non*. Why did he not? He would say nothing specifically, as to arrangements, till after he had been called upon to submit his ideas to the King. And why would he not? And, who can blame Mr. Addington for suspecting the worst. All that Mr. Pitt could be brought to say was, that, he should "propose an administration consisting *prin-"cipally* of the *present* and *late* govern-"ments," and all that Mr. Addington could possibly discover, was, that his dear Pylades intended to take the far greater part of his power away from him, without thanking him for it; which intention, especially if the subject were, as it appears to have been, first broached to Mr. Addington by Lord Melville, was certainly such as no man could have patiently beheld, much less have suffered to be executed, and even have been himself instrumental in executing.

The points in dispute between Messrs. Addington and Pitt are, after all, less interesting to the public than are the facts relative to the disposition of Lords Grenville and Spencer. Both the writers, whose pamphlets it is my object to analyse and compare, have refrained from stating to their readers, whether, or not, these noblemen had consented to be included in the projected new, or, rather, patched up administration. A stranger to the political history of the time alluded to, would, however, believe that they had so consented; for, to those who see through no other medium than the Near Observer and his opponent, the Lords

Grenville and Spencer must appear as "lords "in waiting," ready to enter any when, any where, any way, and for any purpose, that Messrs. Pitt and Addington might agree upon. The advocate of Mr. Pitt does, indeed, in speaking of these lords, make use of an hypothetical phrase: "*if* they *assent*-"*ed*," Mr. Pitt stated, that he should include them. But, every one knows, that such phrases are mere expletives, introduced to give an air of decency to the proposition, in exactly the same way, and for the same purpose, that a minister, in presenting to the Commons a vote of credit, states, that, "*if* the house should *assent* to it," the distribution of the money will be made agreeably to the estimate. This phrase, therefore, as applied to the proposal relative to Lords Grenville and Spencer, does not, in reality, express any *doubt* as to the dispostion of those noble lords, who are, by these wrangling pamphleteers, represented in a light, which is extremely injurious to the character of these noblemen, especially when they are, by the Near Observer, stated to have looked upon a return to office with Mr. Pitt as *repayment* for the call which *they* made in his behalf, at the opening of the session of parliament, and which call never was, at any time, made by Lord Spencer; and, as it is well known, that Lord Melville was, at one time, *actually taking some steps with a view to his being lodged at the Admiralty*, it is evident, that, *before* the negotiation broke off, Lord Spencer was well known to object to the proposition. But, I think it necessary to state here (and I call upon the partisans of either Mr. Addington or Mr. Pitt to contradict me if they can), *that neither Lord Spencer, nor Lord Grenville, ever, either directly or indirectly, signified his wish, or his consent, to make part of the proposed ministry.*

Why Mr. Pitt should be anxious to have with him the Lords Spencer and Grenville has already been suggested; but it is necessary to take some notice of the reason alledged by his advocate and eulogist, the Accurate Observer, that "Mr. "Pitt had no inclination, whether from dis-"approbation of their general measures, or "from objection to any of the steps taken "in the negotiation with France, to take "office merely as an *accession* to the pre-"sent administration." He never was asked; it is not pretended, on either side, that it ever was proposed to him to take office as an "*accession*" to the present administration. The Near Observer declares, that Mr. Pitt, Lord Melville, and several other noble and honourable persons, the friends of Mr. Pitt, were, by Mr. Addington, proposed to be admitted, not upon an equality with himself, but *beyond it*. As this speaks loudly in favour of Mr. Addington, and as it has not been contradicted by Mr. Pitt's partizan, it is but fair to conclude that it is true. Mr. Pitt was never, then, asked to come in as an "accession." But, the reasons given for his objection so to do, appear to me to be far from satisfactory: these are, "his disapprobation of their "*general measures*, and his objection to "some of the *steps taken in the negotiation* "*with France*." As it is the talent of Mr. Pitt so it seems to be that of his defender, to wrap himself round in terms which will bear any meaning, or, if necessary, no meaning at all. What is meant by *general measures?* Does this phrase mean measures in general? Or measures of a general nature? Or measures general in their effect? There is no catching him: he slips through your fingers like an eel; and then you stand and stare as I now do, knowing not what to say, or what to think. If, however, by "general measures" are meant, the great measures of the cabinet, such as the convention with the Northern Powers; the Preliminaries of Peace with France; the Definitive Treaty with that power; the great measures of Finance, and particularly the Consolidation of the Funds, which took place in the summer of 1802; if those were the "general measures" of the ministry, then, I say, that, instead of disapprobation, Mr. Pitt had bestowed, on *all* and on *each* of them, his unqualified approbation, sanctioned, in every instance, by a solemn vote! The Accurate Observer does, indeed, speak of Mr. Pitt's "approving of the treaty of "Amiens, with all the *qualifications* which "accompanied that approval;" and, for a sight of all these qualifications, he refers us to the parliamentary debates of the 3rd of November, 1801, a reference which we shall certainly save ourselves the trouble of making, when we reflect, that the treaty of *Amiens* was not concluded till six months after the date of the said debates. On the *Preliminary* Treaty Mr. Pitt did, indeed, make a very long speech, on the 3d of November, 1801; and that he qualified his expressions one may, without any reference to the speech, venture to allow; for what expression did he ever utter without an accompanying qualification? But, is it fair to consider as qualified, that approval which is the general tenor of a speech, and which is, at last, confirmed by a vote? Mr. Pitt did, as I stated in p. 840, declare that the preliminary treaty "afforded

" matter of *joy* and *exultation* to the coun-
" try, and entitled the government [that is
" the ministers] to its warmest approbation
" and most *grateful thanks*." Yet we are now reminded of " all the qualifications
" which accompanied this approval!"—— During all the discussions on the treaty of Amiens Mr. Pitt spoke only three times; once for the purpose of thwarting the new opposition by shortening the duration of the debates;* the second time to interrupt the argument of Mr. Windham by calling him to order in the midst of his speech;† and the third time to oppose an adjournment of the debate, because he was " ready to vote
" for the amended address, and because he
" was *perfectly satisfied* the arguments so
" ably and *successfully* urged by his noble
" friend," Lord Hawkesbury.‡ Where, then, are we to look for " all the qualifica-
" tions," with which Mr. Pitt gave his approval to the treaty of Amiens? And where, too, are we to look for an apology for the writer, who *now* endeavours to make the world believe in the existence of such qualifications? Yet it is but too true, and it is a fact, which one cannot reflect on without sorrow, that the work of the Accurate Observer, went to the press from beneath the eye, and with the approbation of Mr. Pitt!

Nor will the other ground of Mr. Pitt's reluctance to enter the cabinet as an " ac-
" cession," be found to be more solid; for though " some of the steps taken in the ne-
" gotiation with France," might be unwise enough, what objection could he have to them, which must not, at any rate, have been of weight greatly inferior to the objections, which experience had proved to exist against the general measures of ministers, which measures he had approved of? Why, too, it may be asked, as to all the measures, whether general or particular, to which he objected, did he never come to make his objections *in parliament*, the only place where he could constitutionally give his advice; the place where *duty* to his constituents and his Sovereign bade him appear, and openly object to that which, in the conduct of ministers, he conscientiously regarded as objectionable? " His *health*." ..... His health! Oh shame! That health, which would have permitted him to become minister, to attend the House of Commons and to debate five days in the week, besides attending to all his numerous and important duties out of the house; that health would not permit him to come to parliament *once* to point out the dangers, to which the measures of ministry were exposing the nation!——But, it seems, " that
" Mr. Addington knew of Mr. Pitt's decided
" disapprobation of some of his principal
" measures, before this overture" [for a coalition] " was made."—*Mr. Addington knew of it!!* Without stopping, at present, to make an inquiry as to *what principal* measures took place between June, 1802, and March, 1803, we may surely be permitted to ask, *how* Mr. Addington came to know of Mr. Pitt's decided disapprobation of those measures? And whether this assertion does not most fully corroborate the suspicions, which many persons openly professed to entertain, of an improper, and even an unconstitutional, influence, having, for some time, at least, been exercised by the late minister over his successor; and whether, the " decided disapprobation" of the former was not expressed, the moment that the latter ventured to throw aside his leading strings, and to attempt to support himself by his own strength? This was assuredly the fact; and December, 1802, was the time when the schism, or rather the coolness took place; but, the minister, finding war to be inevitable, " evidently wished," as the Accurate Observer states, " for the
" assistance of Mr. Pitt to support his go-
" vernment." This wish led to the negotiation of Lord Melville, and that negotiation to the rupture, which put an end, for ever, I hope, to a cabinet influence unchecked by even the appearance of responsibility.—So necessary, however, does the Accurate Observer regard the assistance of Mr. Pitt, in this time of difficulty and danger, that he wishes him to have condescended to enter the cabinet, upon almost any terms; " but," he adds, " it was surely for him to *appreciate*
" the *talents* and *qualifications* of those,
" with whom he was to *risk* his character.
" None can question his right to determine
" upon this point for himself." Generally speaking this doctrine is perfectly just: in common cases no one would question this right: but, was this a common case? Was it not, in the month of March, 1803, somewhat late for Mr. Pitt to begin to appreciate the talents and qualifications of Mr. Addington, Lord Hawkesbury, and their colleagues? After having lived with the principal persons of them during half his life; after having, at the end of that time, publicly pronounced on them, individually and collectively, as men and as ministers, a lofty and premeditated eulogium; after having claimed

---

* See Debates, 3d May, 1802, Register, Vol. II. p. 1217.

† May 13, 1802. Register, Vol. II. p. 1300.

‡ Ibid. p. 1304.

and obtained for them the confidence of the Parliament and the country; after all this, it was, methinks, somewhat late to start doubts and objections as to their talents and qualifications, and to entertain fears of what *his character might suffer* in their company; in the company of men, whom to have "*recommended to his Majesty's councils*" his advocate imputes to him as a merit! A merit, for having placed the power of the state, the honour of the crown, and the happines of the people, at the mercy of those, with whom he is afraid to "risk" his own individual reputation! A merit for refusing to trust himself in the cabinet with those very men, whom he had introduced, whom he had intruded, whom he had thrusted, into the closet of his Sovereign!*

[*To be continued.*]

---

* Since the former part of this View appeared, there has been published, in some of the daily prints, a certificate, signed by the bookseller of the CURSORY REMARKS, stating that he has "not disposed of a *single* "copy of that work by order, or on account "of, *the Treasury*." Now, I ask Mr. Hiley Addington if it was candid to make this poor man sign such a paper? "The *Treasury!*" Is it possible, that the "right hon. relation" can hope to ride off upon this? Will the bookseller solemnly declare, that no *civil spoken gentleman* bought 750 copies of him in one, or, at most, in two bargains? Will he solemnly declare, that two book-binders' boys did not go down to the *General Post-Office*, some time in October last, loaded with Cursory Remarks?——The charge is called *libellous*. What! is it libellous to say, that the Treasury purchases pamphlets wholesale, and circulates them through the General Post-Office? Perhaps, then, Mr. Hiley Addington would deny that the *Treasury* purchased and circulated the Vindication of the Convention with Russia, a pamphlet containing a most false and fulsome eulogium on Lord Hawkesbury? Perhaps he would deny, that Mr. Shury was paid by the *Treasury* for printing the PILOT, a work, the stupidity and falsehoods of which soon sent it to the grave, but which, while it existed, was filled, one half with praises of the Addingtons, and the other half with the most loathsome abuse of Lord Grenville and Mr. Windham? Perhaps he would deny, that the *Treasury* had any share in circulating these publications; but I am sure he will not deny, that *he himself*, who was then a *Secretary of the Treasury*, had some hand in it; and, therefore, the evasive certificate, signed by the poor bookseller, will, with the readers of the Register, appear as just so much waste paper. ——The Treasury not only does, but it *ought* to employ the press; and, the only question, in any case, is, whether it employs it properly, or not; a question, which, in the present instance, I have not agitated, having only stated the *fact*, and that for the purpose, not of reproaching the minister with having availed himself of the advantages of his office to circulate an attack upon his party opponent, but merely for that of throwing light on the subject, in the discussion of which I was engaged. How comes it, then, that my statement of this fact should not be noticed till *now*, it having been first made more than two months ago? And how comes it, too, that *my* statement only should meet with a denial, such as it is, while no notice whatever is taken of a similar statement made by the Accurate Observer, at the very outset of his pamphlet, where he not only says, that the *Secretaries of the Treasury* have assisted in the circulation of the Cursory Remarks, but that "they lend "their name and authority to the principal "statements it contains, and express their "sense of the propriety of its publication?" The truth is, that Mr. Addington now begins to *feel*, that he cannot, without the support of Mr. Pitt, resist the force, which is, at last, both in and out of Parliament, gathering together against him; and, as he must be aware of the resentment that the Cursory Remarks have excited, and, in some degree, justly excited, in the breast of Mr. Pitt, he is anxious to exculpate himself from the imputation of having lent his aid to that publication; and, in this hopeful enterprize, a bookseller has not been thought unworthy of being pressed into the service!

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.—The report of a negotiation among the principal neutral powers of the continent, for the restoration of peace, is still repeated in the papers which have been last received from there.——The dispute between the Emperor of Germany and the Elector of Bavaria, which was caused by the sudden expulsion of a small detachment of Imperial troops, from Oberhaus, by a body of Bavarian troops, has been amicably adjusted.——The loan of three millions which General Berthier lately exacted of the Hanse-towns, was raised for the service of Hanover, upon the security of the property of the King of England, which remains in the Electorate.

[*To be continued.*]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AMERICA.—By a reference to p. 880 et seq., it will be seen, that, in consequence of a convention between the United States of America and France, the former obtained the right of possessing Louisiana; but, we now learn, from American papers and letters, that the Spaniards refuse to evacuate New Orleans and the other parts, which they are in actual possession of; and, in fact, that, though they were ready, though an order was issued from the Court of Madrid, to give up the country to the French, they are by no means disposed to yield it to the Americans. This is very strange; so strange, that were not the fact confirmed in the best possible way, every one acquainted with the degraded state of the Spanish power would hesitate to believe it; and, it is absolutely impossible to suppose, that the Spaniards are now making this resistance, unabetted or unbacked by some other power. Is it impossible that our ministers have bethought themselves of some trick relative to Louisiana? And are we to look upon this resistance on the part of Spain as the price of neutrality with respect to Great-Britain? This would be curious enough; but, the probable conjecture is, that the French are resolved not to yield the country till *after* they are paid, and, perhaps, not even then. They have, very likely, only made a sham transfer of it to America, in order to cover it from the hands of Great-Britain, till the war is over, and the obstacle; now raised against the Americans taking possession, is, most probably, only intended to amuse the people of America, till the end of the war, or for a year or two, at least. A short time will, however, show us the bottom of this artifice.

THE CONTINENT appears to be alarmed at the increase of the power of France. In Russia a small augmentation of the army has taken place, and there is some *talk* of hostile preparations on the part of the Court of Vienna; but, even if the dispositions and preparations of those courts were ten times as great as they are, there would be no hope of obtaining their co-operation against France, while England is governed by a ministry, in whom no foreigner upon the face of the earth has any confidence. Though Russia may be jealous of, and displeased with France, it will require diplomatic skill, other than that possessed by Lord Hawkesbury, to persuade that power to embark in a war, the ostensible object of which is, to give us Malta in perpetuity. For this reason it is, that the Moniteur (of the 8th instant) so confidently declares to us: "You "shall *not* retain Malta; you shall *not* ob- "tain Lampedosa, and you shall sign a "treaty *less advantageous to you than that* "*of Amiens!*" This is a threat much more terrible than that of invasion, and a threat, too, which, if the present ministry remain in power, or if the Volunteer System be persisted in, will most assuredly be carried into execution. The public prints are flattering themselves, that, because the Moniteur denies that the Consul has ever pledged himself to invade England, and because that paper now states, that he only said he would form camps along the coast; this has led our small politicians to conclude that the Consul is "drawing in his *horns*." As alluding to the improved state of Buonaparté's conjugal concerns, this may be considered as a passable pun; but, really, it would be difficult for any rational man to discover, in these expressions of the Moniteur, any hope of having broken or lowered the spirit of our enemy. What does Buonaparté want to do more than he is now doing? What state, if he could have his utmost wishes; what state, worse than our present state, could he, as yet, desire to see us in? Penned up in our island; trembling at his threats; preparing to fortify our capital, and to inundate our counties; giving bounties of 40 guineas a man for soldiers; having 400,000 of our shop-keepers armed, and the greater part of them under the controul of committees; with "the spirit of rebellion and "insurrection actually raging in Ireland," to such a degree as to require the terrors of martial law to keep them down; without being able to make one war-like effort, living at a war expenditure of £42,000,000 a year, in addition to £26,000,000 a year expenses of public debt, civil list, and miscellanies; and, though last not least, with Mr. Addington and Lord Hawkesbury for ministers; what more, what worse, what greater calamity and disgrace could even Buonaparté have wished us? It is incredible, that he should have hoped, so soon to have reduced us to this state; and, yet, there are persons who believe, or affect to believe, that he is *disheartened!*

IRELAND.—It appears, that the following paragraph has been inserted in all the Dublin news-papers.—"In the report given in "some of the newspapers of the debate of "the army estimates, it is said to have been "asserted by Mr. Fox, "that it was well "known that General Fox made more pre- "parations against the insurrection of the "23d of July than the lord lieutenant

"thought necessary; and that in conse-
"quence he had written for the general,
"saying, 'in consequence of your prepa-
"'rations, I suppose you have received ad-
"'ditional intelligence.'—We have autho-
"rity to say, that no letter bearing such
"construction, was at any time written by
"the lord lieutenant to the general."—It is strange that this paragraph should be published, as it apparently has been, *by authority*. It is a mark of great indiscretion, to say the least of it; because it renders the proposed motion of Admiral Berkeley absolutely necessary. The parties are now at issue upon a point of *fact*, of fact, too, that admits of clear and satisfactory proof, on one side or the other, without a possibility of making disclosures inconsistent with the public welfare; and, therefore, the ministers can have no grounds whatever, whereon to oppose *an inquiry*.

DOLLARS, it is said, are soon to be issued as currency. The nominal value, at which these dollars will pass, will, at once, show us, and the whole world, whether the non-payment of specie at the bank, has been, as some persons insist, no injury at all to the credit of its paper. The stirling value of the Spanish and American dollar is, four shillings and sixpence: before the bank restriction, it always passed for 4s. 6d. in exchange against English bank notes; and, if it passes at the same rate *now*, I shall be ready to confess my error; and to allow, that the bank notes are not at all depreciated. ——Having touched upon this topic I shall take the opportunity of explaining the grounds, on which, in my last sheet, I ventured to dissent from an opinion of Lord Grenville's, which, as I then stated, appeared to me to be erroneous. His lordship had said, that, great as the increase of *bank paper* had been, since the restriction, the increase of *private paper* had been, proportionally much greater, and for this very obvious cause, that, for private paper *cash may legally be demanded*, while for bank paper it cannot. This notion seemed to me not to be quite correct, because, as bank paper is, in all cases, a protection against arrests for debt; and, as private paper can, at worst, be no more than a proof of debt, the holder of such paper has finally no remedy other than that which he would have if he were the holder of bank paper, because this latter paper can, at any time, be tendered to him in payment of his private paper; and the *issuer of private paper* has, therefore, always the power to transform himself into the *tenderer of bank paper*. I did not mean to say, that a tender of bank paper was, in any case, a *discharge* of debt, unless the creditor chose to receive it as such. I know, that the holder of private paper may demand from the private banker *the full value of it in cash*, which he cannot do with respect to the Bank of England? but I also know, that if the private banker tender to the said holder Bank of England notes in payment of the private paper, that he, the said holder, cannot arrest him. He may, indeed, levy an execution for the debt, or he may sue out a commission of bankruptcy for the refusal to pay in specie; but these things he can also do, with respect to *every debtor who tenders him Bank of England notes, and who refuses to pay him* IN SPECIE, being the lawful coin of the kingdom; a circumstance of which, at the present moment, every man ought to be apprized. The only difference, as to the point in question, between private paper and bank paper, appears to be this: all the parties both *tendering* and *issuing* the former, are liable to be sued; but *tenderers* only, and not the *issuers*, of the latter are liable to such process. Bank paper, *after* it gets into circulation, is not a *discharge* of debt, but, in cases where the *Bank itself* is the debtor, it *is a discharge of debt!* How far this circumstance may have operated in producing a preference of private paper, and in what degree it favours the opinion of Lord Grenville, I have not the means of ascertaining; but, it is to be presumed, that his lordship did not speak without possessing full information on the subject.

VOLUNTEER-COMMITTEES.—In my last sheet, I promised to return to this subject, and to give a more detailed account of volunteer committees than I had theretofore given. When Mr. Windham cited a volunteer corps governed by a committee, and besought parliament to direct their attention to the subject, he was told, that the corps he had alluded to was "a *solitary* instance, "and that even that corps he had not "thought proper to *name*." This was said by Mr. Hiley Addington, on the 14th inst. and was accompanied with a heinous *charge* against Mr. Windham, of his being *unpopular* in every part of the country. To this one may reply: "so much the worse for the "country." But, as to the assertion, that the corps alluded to by Mr. Windham was a *solitary* instance, and even that without a *name*, the best answer is to name some corps having a committee, and, for this reason, I now name the Duke of Gloucester's Loyal Volunteers, commanded by Lord Viscount Chetwynd. The *constitution* of some corps was quoted by Mr. Windham and Dr. Laurence, but, that of Lord Chetwynd's I shall now give at full length as follows:

"*Declaration, Rules, and Regulations, of the Duke of Gloucester's Loyal Volunteers, commanded by Colonel Lord Viscount Chetwynd. London: printed by J. Downes, Strand*, 1803.

"DECLARATION.——We who have hereunto subscribed our names, do enroll ourselves to serve personally in the corps of the Duke of Gloucester's Loyal Volunteers.——We declare that we will, at our expense, provide ourselves with uniform cloathing and accoutrements, according to patterns agreed upon, and will serve without emolument; arms and ammunition being provided by government.——That previously to receiving arms, we will take the oath of allegiance.——That we will meet for training and exercising, as often as may be deemed requisite for the maintenance of order and discipline.——That we will, upon all occasions, be in readiness to preserve peace, and protect the persons and property of our fellow subjects within the metropolis; it being fully understood by us, that this Declaration is not to be considered as claiming any limitation or restriction of service, which may, in the smallest degree, interfere with the exercise of his Majesty's ancient and undoubted prerogative of requiring the military service of his subjects in case of invasion of the realm.—— And lastly, we do in honor bind ourselves to be obedient to all the lawful commands of our officers, whilst on military duty, and also to *abide by all rules and regulations formed, or to be formed, by the present* OR FUTURE *committee, when confirmed by a majority of the corps*."

"RULES AND REGULATIONS.—I. That the *affairs of the corps be managed by a committee* to be appointed quarterly, and to consist of one field officer, one captain, one lieutenant, one ensign, one serjeant, and sixteen privates, (*i. e.* two from each company) seven to be a quorum, of which *six* must be privates.——The other field officers may be present and deliver their sentiments at all meetings of the committee; but *one* only shall be entitled to *vote*.—II. That the field officers be elected in rotation, commencing with the colonel; the other officers by and out of their respective ranks; and the privates (two) by and out of their respective companies. *The officers* and one *half* of *the privates* to be *changed* at every election, and no one to be eligible for more than *two quarters in succession*.——III. That the committee meet in the orderly room on the first and third Wednesday in every month, and at any other times the superior officer upon the committee may direct, provided due notice be given by the secretary to each member.——IV. That the committee shall, whenever requested by *twenty members* of the corps (signified in writing to the secretary, and stating the business to be brought forward) call a *general meeting* to be held within seven days after the request be transmitted to the committee, who shall also give to every member of the corps, three days notice of such intended meeting and the purport of it.——V. That out of the committee for the time being, there be chosen a sub-committee, to consist of three members, who shall superintend the receipts and disbursements of the corps, sign the drafts or orders upon the treasurer, (which shall be countersigned by the secretary) and make a monthly report of the state of the finances to the committee.——VI. That each member pay annually, if necessary, a subscription of one guinea and an half, to create a fund for defraying the incidental expenses of the corps, to become due upon the first day of August, and that the same be paid to the collector within one month of that date.——VII. That in order to meet the wishes of a number of persons of rank, respectability, and fortune, who being prevented by sex, age, or state of health, from affording personal aid, desire, nevertheless, to evince their loyalty and shew their approbation of the public spirited motives which have induced the formation of this corps, by contributing to the extraordinary expenses thereof; the treasurer be empowered to receive from such persons a subscription of not less than two guineas.—— VII. That each *person desirous of becoming a member of this corps*, shall, if proposed and seconded, be *balloted for* at the next meeting of *the committee*; a majority of black balls *to exclude*.——IX. That no person be admissible at any *future period* who may once have been *rejected upon a ballot*.——X. That every new member do, within ten days after having received notice from the secretary of his admission, sign the Declaration, also pay his subscription, and commence his attendance at drill.——XI. That every member provide accoutrements and an uniform dress, in all respects conformable to the patterns and printed description, within one month from the time of his admission.——XII. That no member be permitted to join the ranks until he shall have obtained a certificate of his being qualified for the same, either from the Adjutant or superintending officer of the drills, such certificate to be signed also by the commanding officer of the company to which he is attached——XIII. That each unqualified person attend at least four drills in each week, but such as possess a certificate for the ranks be exempt from such attendance.——XIV. That if any member appear with uniform or accoutrements not regular and clean, or without powder in his hair, he shall not be permitted to fall into the ranks.——XV. That the serjeants of the respective companies do, in rotation, call the roll precisely at the time fixed; and that no member shall be considered as present unless he be in his station before the termination of the roll-call. ——XVI. That no member be absent from the general muster or field days, without *leave from the committee*, or the commanding officer; unless he assign in writing an apology for his absence.—— XVII. That *apologies* be addressed to the commanding officer of the respective companies, and transmitted by him *to the Committee* for examination or enquiry, and that none be received after the commencement of the roll-call.——XVIII. That every person be, whilst under arms, attentive and obedient to such commands of the respective officers, as may be expedient to promote discipline. That no one be permitted to talk whilst in the ranks, or draw off the attention of others from their duty, nor shall any one leave his station without permission.——XIX. That commissioned officers be *elected by a ballot of the corps*, that future candidates for commissions be *approved* by the officers already appointed. That one month be allowed to qualify for the duties; and if, at the expiration of that time, any one elected be found by the field officers and adjutant, incompetent, an application for a commission be withheld, and the appointment declared void.—— XX. That non-commisioned officers be *elected by and out of their respective companies*, and be subject to the preceding rule of qualification.——XXI. That at the first general meeting after Michaelmas, Christmas, Lady Day, and Midsummer, *the committee shall fix* the days and hours for drilling, and also the general muster and field days to be held

during that quarter.——XXII. That if *any member* refuse to conform to the rules and regulations established, or behave himself in a refractory or ungentleman-like manner, his conduct shall be enquired into by the committee, *who* shall have full power to *fine, censure,* or *expel him.*——XXIII. That the fine for any single act, be not less than one shilling, nor more than five.——XXIV. That the serjeants do, the first week of every month, and by rotation, collect the fines, report the amount, and give in a list of the defaulters to the committee, and pay whatever sums may have been received to the treasurer.——XXV. That it being expedient to ascertain at all times, as nearly as possible, the number of effective members, every person be required to send to the commanding officer of his company, early information of illness, or an obligation to leave town. — XXVI. That a *court of honour* be established, and annually *elected by the committee,* to consist of one field officer, two captains, and three privates, above thirty years of age, who shall take cognizance of real or supposed causes of offence, or disputes which may have occurred amongst members of the corps whilst on duty, and that every member shall be bound in honour to abide by its decision, and *to refrain from seeking any other mode of redress.*——XXVII. That no *resignation* be accepted unless 10 days notice of the intention has been given in writing *to the committee,* and all arrears paid.——XXVIII. That no additional rules or regulations shall be *established,* nor any that have been agreed upon *rescinded,* unless proposed *by the committee,* and confirmed by the corps at *a general meeting,* who shall individually have been apprised of the subject, at least three days previous to such meeting.——That the preceding engagements and regulations be signed by the colonel, and a sufficient number of copies be printed and delivered to each member of the corps without delay.

CRETWYND, Col. D. G. L. V.
Passed at a general meeting of the corps,
August 18, 1803.
J. HASLEWOOD, Sec.
D. G. L. V."

Here, to use a vulgar phrase, is "chapter "and verse for it." It will now hardly be denied, even by Mr. *Colonel* Hiley Addington, that there is *one* corps governed by a committee. But, it is notorious, that almost every volounteer corps is so governed. I will just, however, name a few places, where there are such corps; to wit; Bromley, Dorking, Croydon, Mitcham, Wandsworth, Kingston, Twickenham, Richmond, Putney, Fulham; and, in town, Inns of Court, St. James's, St. Margaret's, Westminster, St. Giles's and St. George's Bloomsbury. Here are cities, towns, and villages; and, these not selected; but taken as they came to hand. Not one volunteer corps of infantry, in short, do I know, or have I heard of, except the corps of Lord Chesterfield and Mr. Windham, which has not its committee of some sort or other; and, it was something which would have astonished any stranger to hear the Right Honourable Mr. Colonel Hiley Addington insist, that the corps mentioned by Mr. Windham was a *solitary* instance, when it had, but a day or two before, been acknowledged, in Parliament, by the Attorney-General and Mr. Erskine, that the two corps, to which they belonged, had committees attached to them.——It will be said, perhaps, that the greater part of the committees have no power over any thing but the *pecuniary* affairs. That this is not the case in Lord Chetwynd's corps will not be denied. I do not believe it is so in any one of the corps that I have mentioned; and though the reader will perceive how difficult it must be for me to come at proof positive as to the *precise* powers of these committees, I am enabled to state, that I have now before me, a resolution of the committee of the Mitcham corps, *expelling two men, for misbehaviour at drill*; and, I confidently state, that the committee of the St. Giles's and St. George's Bloomsbury *elect the officers*; and, that they raise money upon the parishes, the Parliament and the public have been already very well informed. Of this last corps the King's Advocate, Sir John Nicholl, is colonel, and of this very committee, the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench are *members!* Yet his Majesty's ministers, in the House of Commons, expressed their *surprize* and *horror*, when they were told of the existence of such committees! A due sense of respect for the character of the noble lords above-mentioned, bids me state here, that neither of them had any hand in, or any knowledge of, the address to the inhabitants of the parishes of St. Giles, and St. George which address was mentioned with such merited disapprobation, in the House of Commons; and, I believe, that they were, on the contrary, amongst the persons aimed at in the address, as not having contributed in proportion to their means. Every way that you turn this system, it presents new deformity. Here we find it, first mixing these great and venerable characters with common tradesmen, and next exposing them to public reproach; reproach, too, which they certainly did not merit; for, if they had subscribed very large sums to the volunteer fund, they would, thereby, only have laid the foundation for exhorbitant claims upon others.—— Returning to the committees, I cannot, for my part, see the drift of those, who wish us to believe, that their powers are entirely confined to *pecuniary* matters. "Money is "the sinews of war," and sinews certainly not less necessary in civil than in foreign war; and, therefore, to desire us to conclude,

that committees will always remain feeble and harmless, merely because they hold the purse strings, is, I must say it, a most unreasonable request.——Though this source of danger was treated very lightly in the House of Commons, it appears to have acquired consideration in its passage to the upper House; for, on the 16th instant, we find the ministers seriously protesting against volunteer committees. We find that respectable nobleman, Earl Romney, hitherto a distinguished friend of the volunteers, declaring, that, "much as he approves of "the volunteer system, he is ready to con- "fess, that, rather than have corps with "such committees, he would not have the "corps at all; for, that, if these commit- "tees are suffered to exist, he has no "hesitation to say, that the monarchy is "not safe for six months." These were, as near as possible, his lordship's very words. Lord Grenville, on the same occasion, said, that the *sort* of powers vested in the committees was of little consequence. If there were committees of any kind, and for any purpose, they ought to be done away; for that, if they could deliberate and debate upon one subject, they would upon another subject; and, that, it was by such a club system that the monarchy of France was overthrown.——It is but a short time since a publication appeared in the newspapers, stating, that *delegates* from the several volunteer-corps, in and about the metropolis, had met in *general committee*, for the purpose of devising and fixing upon a plan to raise a fund for the cure, or the support, of such volunteers or their families as might be injured, either directly or indirectly, by accidents happening while at exercise, &c. &c. If they could affiliate for this purpose, so could they for any other purpose; let, therefore, any unprejudiced man say, whether there is not just cause of apprehension: let him recollect the *garde nationale*, the *Champ de Mars*; and let him not forget *Louis the Sixteenth!* I am ready to allow, that there is not, at this time, one man in the kingdom belonging to these committees, who has ever conceived the idea of using his power for a disloyal purpose; but, nearly, if not quite, as much might have been said of the first clubs in France, and the first town-meeting committees in America, all of which did, however, at last, heartily join in destroying the governments of those countries respectively; indeed, it was, in both instances, those little parliaments which effected the revolution. The wish to have the appearance of economy has induced the ministers to throw the chief part of the expenses of the volunteer corps on the public, in the shape of *subscriptions*: this teaches the corps the *way of raising money*, an art which it is very dangerous to render familiar to men, who are organized into a body, and who have arms in their hands. Out of this economical part of the system the committees have arisen; and, if times of great public distress should arrive, who will attempt to set bounds to the demands of bodies of armed men directed by such committees? Again, I must beg leave to observe, and to beseech the ministers to keep in mind, that those persons, who compose the committees *now* will not compose them a year or eighteen months hence, especially if the times become calamitous or turbulent. The present members will not, they *cannot*, long remain; they must be called away by their business or their pleasures, and their places will, with some very few exceptions, be filled by men, to whom a seat in a volunteer committee will be regarded as an enviable promotion. Then democracy will begin to shew its undisguised front. The volunteer corps will soon become a great and distinct member of the body politic; and, after that, only let there come an alarming scarcity of provisions, a great and sudden depreciation of bank notes, or some such calamity, and farewell for ever, at once and instantly farewell to all that is dear to us, all that we are now ready to lay down our lives to preserve!

ERRATA in the last sheet, p. 847, l. 12, for *distant* read *distinct*, p. 880, for *negligent* read *malignant*.

COBBETT'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES. The three first numbers of this work have been published, and the correctness and impartiality with which they are executed, have, as it was hoped and expected, given universal satisfaction. To obtain for the work a decided preference to all others, professing the same object, it does, indeed, only require a very slight comparison between them. The fourth number will appear on Wednesday next, and will contain the report of the very interesting debate on the Army Estimates. Gentlemen who wish to have this work sent to the country are respectfully reminded, that it has no stamp, and cannot be sent post free; it must be obtained in the same way as Magazines and Reviews are. It is published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street; and sold also by J. Budd, Pall Mall; J. Ginger, Piccadilly; and J. Richardson, Royal Exchange; and may be had of every Bookseller and Newsman in the United Kingdom.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.